



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Germany wants more battleships and so does France, and does this, too, mean peace? And is our country leading in the way by which God shall be exalted in the earth? What do we read hereabout in Holy Writ? "He maketh wars to cease unto the end of the earth; he breaketh the bow and cutteth the spear in sunder; he burneth the chariot in the fire. Be still and know that I am God: I will be exalted among the heathen, I will be exalted in the earth."

WEST CHESTER, PA.

The Duty of Churches Towards the Peace Movement.

REV. R. F. JOHONNOT,

Pastor of Unity Church, Oak Park, Illinois.

A world-wide movement is in progress to abolish war, at least so far as civilized nations are concerned, among themselves. Despite all the scoffs of Philistinism as to its impracticable character, the movement has made rapid and steady progress. This movement should appeal strongly to the Christian church. The chief mission of Christ was to do away with hatred and warfare among men, and to bring in the reign of peace on earth and goodwill among men of all nations. Whatever differences may exist among churches regarding the need to save men from some future hell, all can agree upon the need of saving men from the hell of warfare during this present life.

A great moral duty lies upon all churches to aid and foster in every way the movement for universal peace. One might naturally expect the church to have begun this work, and to have been first and foremost in its prosecution. Undoubtedly its preaching has done much to make the movement possible, but the church has contented itself too much with what general influence it might exert in the direction of many humane movements, and has not worked for them in any direct or organized way. Such was the case with regard to the freedom of the negro slaves in this country. Without doubt the church has suffered for its lack of aggressive advocacy of humanitarian reforms. It has lost thus the confidence and support of many of the noblest souls. It has often allowed the work it should have done to pass to other hands. This is one reason why the church has fallen so low in the minds of many, and has lost the prestige and influence it should have.

The peace movement is being fostered and sustained by organizations outside of the church. In general, the church is only lukewarm in what support it gives. But it should be active and aggressive along this line of work, because in no other way can it do more good or better carry out and put into practical operation the gospel of Christ.

No man can doubt the evil and horror of war. Its evil lies not only in the death and suffering it brings to combatants and their friends, in the economic loss and poverty it entails, but in the moral corruption and degradation it brings in its trail, and in the spirit of cruelty and long-continued hatred it begets. In this moral evil lies the chief reason why the church should oppose war.

Some evils seem necessary; at least we have not found

the way to do away with them. But we have an easy, logical and practical method for making wars to cease. There is no dispute which can arise between nations which may not better be settled by arbitration than by war. The only justification that can be urged for war is its necessity to maintain order, to do justice or to increase freedom and to give play to truth and right. But one can never be sure that a war begun for even the most righteous purposes or under the severest provocations will result in the triumph of truth and right. On the contrary, it may result in the triumph of tyranny and set back the cause of progress. It can guarantee only the supremacy of might.

In the light of modern experience, the practicability of international arbitration and its more certain guaranty of justice and right, war has no longer any justification. If the church does not by active work, by direct preaching, by financial aid, help on with all its power the movement to abolish war, now that it is shown practicable, it will be derelict to its imperative duty as an exponent of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

Private and Public Warfare.

BY A. B. FARQUHAR.

Much of the seductive glamour which surrounds military achievements, military display and military ideals for many eyes, comes from a failure either to understand the close similarity between the national wars of to-day and the private wars of the Dark Ages, or to picture to oneself the way life was actually lived in the days when the feuds of petty noblemen figured so largely on the historic canvas.

In the first place, it is impossible to bring forward any reason for arming one nation against another, aggressively or even defensively, that will not serve as a reason, quite as cogent and quite as urgent, for arming one citizen against his neighbor. "In time of peace prepare for war," we are told; but that applies equally to near and to remote possible enemies—or perhaps more to those nearer us, for they can strike more quickly. If every foreign country is a possible enemy, it is quite as rational to look the same way upon every fellow-citizen. If forts and cannon and war vessels are needed in dealing with the foreigner, something proportionally effective must be used for the neighboring rival. The necessity for being on our guard against the one and against the other is of the same kind.

In the second place, how many of us have ever undertaken to bring fully before our minds the condition of our ancestors in the "good old times" of knight-errantry and predatory barons and mediæval castles and chain-armor? In the happier days in which our lot is cast those institutions have vanished, or remain only as far-scattered curiosities. To none of us are they altogether unknown; to many, doubtless, they have a picturesque interest that makes them rather attractive than disgusting or horrible; but to very few indeed does the idea of them call up a vivid picture of the age when they were the prominent features of daily life. If I try to suppose myself within such surroundings, looking on every neighbor as a powerful foe, only restrained by the utmost efforts I can make from surprising me any night, burning my home and laying waste my possessions, perhaps slaying

my family and myself, the rest follows as a matter of course. I must gather retainers about me, more of them if possible than he can command, and keep them more effectively armed. I dare not let them do much at cultivating the ground,—not more than enough to provide the most necessary food,—for the attack may come upon me any hour. I must make my home as much like a penitentiary as my means allow, with stone walls and iron bars and moats and scanty contracted windows; must put up drawbridge for door and portcullis for portico, and provide a warder for every opening. When I venture forth, I must put on helmet and corselet and greaves, and only move under guard, for fear of some neighbor,—whose possible onslaught may, after all, be undertaken only because he apprehends the same offensive operations from me, and judges it better to let the battle come before I prepare myself too completely. Such a state of mind, with all thoughts given to hostilities, is but too prone to become contagious and afflict a whole community. The more one man arms and fortifies, the more is another impelled to follow his example, even surpassing it if he can. Thus is the citizen's attention turned away from production to destruction, from aid in building up the social fabric to the devil's service in battering it to pieces.

The contrast has often been drawn between man's feebleness when alone and his mighty power in combination with his fellows. Is there any need of comparing universal coöperation with universal hostility to decide which of the two makes him more effective in forming and strengthening the state, and in doing the work for which he was placed on this earth? Is there any need of further inquiry, when we know that one age of history was distinguished by general antagonism and another by general helpfulness, why the former age proved utterly barren and the latter age wonderfully rich in those triumphs of mind over matter, of knowledge and inventive skill, which form the truest claim of humanity to greatness? The reason why we so unhesitatingly speak of the nineteenth as a greater century than the fifteenth, for example, in the world's history, cannot be intelligently given without frankly confessing the superiority of the social institutions that we have developed by outgrowing distrust of our fellows and promoting sympathy with them.

The fact is, a community, such as we now know, could not survive if man looked upon his neighbor in any such way as every nation continues to look upon other nations. The wholesale distrust which would necessarily prove the ruin of any community can be indulged with greater impunity among nations, not at all because it is not harmful in the wider as in the narrower field, but because the harm it does is less easy to detect and discriminate, less constant and violent in its working. Most of us rarely, some of us never, pass a day when some matter of high importance to our welfare does not depend on our ability to confide in our fellows, often to the extent of entrusting our lives to strangers, as in travel by railway or steamship, stopping at hotels, or even walking the streets. We feel the same confidence, it may be added, to almost the same degree, in foreign countries as in our own. Yet we regard it as necessary in our dealings on a national scale to abandon this attitude of confidence, so satisfactory to us in individual dealings, to regard our

brother nation as we never—until compelled by irresistible proofs—regard our fellow-man,—as a natural enemy, who is only pretending to be anything else in order to gain time and opportunity for a deadlier blow. The individual German or Japanese or Chinaman we trust, but the nation of Germans or Japanese or Chinamen—an aggregate of units each of which we might treat as we would a fellow-citizen—is to be looked upon as imagining only evil, and that continually.

There never was any progress in understanding the laws of higher organisms till the philosophers began to see in them consolidations and further developments of simpler organisms. Thus they learned how the animated being was a combination of cells, the whole having the character, in a way, of all its elements; thus the community was understood through its component individuals and the human aggregate through the small social units combining to form it. One of the laws brought to light by this comparative study is that of a tendency on the part of the more complex organism to follow the same lines of development traced out by the simpler, but to be slower in reaching a corresponding stage. For example, the cell may form, mature in size and function, and decay in a few hours, while the being of which it forms part requires many years to grow, ripen and pass away. So it was long ago observed that the national aggregate, passing through stages of development similar to those in the life-history of the smaller social units, was always several centuries later in reaching corresponding points. If this is a law of nature we must accept it as such, and repress our disappointment that nation lags so far behind community in this important progress from distrust and hostility to amity and coöperation. Nevertheless, assured as we must be of the direction that national progress is to take, may we not reasonably hope soon to see some clear indication of a substantial advance in that direction?

YORK, PA.

Peace Work in the South.

BY THOMAS J. MIDDLETON.

Editor of the Ellis County Mirror.

[From a Letter sent to the Texas State Peace Congress in November.]

Examining one of our standard revised cyclopedias, I find the article on "Peace" starting out, "A suspension of war, etc.," as though war were yet the normal condition of man; and the article on "War," which covers ten times the space of the one given to "Peace," says of war, "Its permanence is thoroughly believed in by those who seem most competent to judge."

Again, one writer, speaking of our threatened war with Spain in 1873, says that in our diplomacy we cabled the things that made for war, while we sent by mail the things that made for peace; and it may thus be seen how in our literature, and even in our government itself, obstacles have been continually thrown in the way of peace.

War always makes a parade, while peace is content with quieter methods; and it would be amusing, if it were not so serious, to watch the working out of some of our ideas and movements in this country and government, which, offered ostensibly for peace, can but logically and finally lead to war. And in this connection we